Andrea's Legacy: The Stoltenberg Facebook Exchange, February 2016

[Primary source transcript, prepared July 22, 2026. Original exchange took place on Facebook, February 27, 2016, on Nikki Craft's timeline (facebook.com/nikkiXXcraft/posts/161266137590173), screenshotted February 27, 2023. Transcribed verbatim, including typos in third-party comments, to preserve the record accurately. Family tag AD-1, first entry in a new Andrea Dworkin Legacy documentation series.]

Introduction

This exchange looks, at first glance, like a disagreement about a book review byline. It isn't really that. It's a document about who gets to control what remains of a dead woman's legacy — her writing, her friendships, her actual positions on contested political questions — and about the asymmetry between the person who holds legal copyright and the person who holds the lived memory.

John Stoltenberg, Andrea Dworkin's widower and the executor of her literary estate, opens by disputing whether Dworkin consented to being named coauthor of a piece Craft wrote. By Craft's account, John had told her she could not post a private postcard Dworkin had sent her, asserting he controlled the copyright to everything Dworkin ever wrote. Craft posted it anyway, and told him she would burn her own archive before giving him access to it. That confrontation is the real backdrop the thread below plays out against, even though the postcard itself is never mentioned in it directly.

What follows is the exchange as it actually happened, transcribed verbatim for readability and searchability. Nothing has been corrected, smoothed over, or reworded, on either side of the dispute; that includes typos in other commenters' posts, preserved exactly as they were written. The original screenshots remain in Craft's own files for verification if ever needed.

Context

This thread began with a post by John Stoltenberg, Andrea Dworkin's widower and the executor of her literary estate, disputing whether Dworkin had consented to being named coauthor of a book review Craft wrote. The exchange expands into disputes over Dworkin's relationship to trans-inclusive politics, John Money, and Stoltenberg's practice of deleting threads and censoring commenters on his own Facebook timeline — including, according to Craft, a prior thread in which Stoltenberg himself had posted a video specifically framed around the importance of civil discourse and hearing opposing arguments.

This is presented here as a faithful record of the exchange, not as an adjudication of the underlying disputes — whether Dworkin consented to coauthorship, and questions about her views on trans inclusion, are genuinely contested claims between people who knew her, and this document does not resolve them. It preserves what was actually said, by whom, and in what order.

What isn't visible in the thread itself is the immediate provocation behind it. Shortly before this exchange, Stoltenberg had told Craft she could not post a postcard she had received from Dworkin on Facebook, asserting that he controlled the copyright to everything Dworkin ever wrote. Craft posted it anyway that same night, and told him directly that she would burn her own archive of Dworkin material before she would ever give him access to it. Stoltenberg's line in the post below — "The meanings in Andrea's published work belong to the world. But her byline doesn't" — was written days after he had already moved, in practice, to control not just Dworkin's byline but a private, personal keepsake Dworkin had given Craft directly. That context is Craft's own account, not yet independently dated or sourced beyond her memory; the postcard itself, if located, would confirm it directly.

The Original Post — John Stoltenberg, February 27, 2016

> "Nikki, I think it is highly doubtful that Andrea consented to be named as coauthor of that book review you wrote. She coauthored very little in her life. The notable exception is the civil-rights anti-pornography ordinance she coauthored with MacKinnon; I can't offhand think of much else. I can believe Andrea may have offered you editorial and writing advice, but by that logic — and on the evidence of the paper trail of drafts of my writings on which she made notations — I too could claim they were coauthored by me and her. But that would be

fraudulent misrepresentation. I can believe Andrea helped try to get your piece published, but that just evidences she was a good friend; that doesn't prove she wanted her name on a book review that — read alongside the book reviews she actually did write and publish under her name — comes nowhere near the quality or voice of her own writing."

"Not incidentally, proof that Andrea was critical of John Money hardly qualifies as proof she was not and would not be trans inclusive. The trans community has been vocal in its denunciation of John Money. And if one takes on board the trans community's critique, anyone trans inclusive would HAVE to be anti Money."

"As you know, I am fine with all civil discourse from anyone whose memory of Andrea's life and reading of her work differs from mine. The meanings in Andrea's published work belong to the world. But her byline doesn't."

(39 comments, 2 shares, at time of screenshot)

Comments

Nikki Craft

John did you report me to Facebook for copyright violation? I just got an indication that you did. I have been giving you the benefit of the doubt. So what is it?

John Stoltenberg

Nope. But I appreciate your checking.

Nikki Craft

ok good. glad you did not.

Katarina Vidović

By representing Andrea Dworkin as "trans inclusive" what you do to her whole work is one major reversal. In fact you make pornography of her legacy. And you know it perfectly well. [link: news.met.police.uk — "Woman convicted of father's murder"]

There is nothing radical in being trans inclusive. Quite the opposite - it means to be pro status quo of male domination. It's not news that throughout history men have been deciding and determining what woman is. What is new is that neoliberal neopatriarchal colonial queer trans ideology legitimize annihilation of women as such. Would Andrea not be able to see that? I doubt it.

Kathy Miriam

I'd like to see evidence beyond woman aging that she was trans inclusive. I personally know that is not true!

I only see a focus on woman hating and I know she changed her position since that earliest work . on trans. So where is stuff on right wing women?

Nancy J Meyer can you see this?

Nikki Craft

John again you told me i would not be allowed to post my links on your page and I respected that. Please apply the same to yourself as you did to me and do not post any links to my page.

John Stoltenberg More links? really? I'm deleting it.

Deleting this link to the conversation. Damn you posted about five links to my facebook page. if there are any more can you please delete them?

Nikki Craft

John, Andrea and i worked on the phone together to get the wording just right on that article. When I publish the web version of it I will make it more clear, but had to save space and explanation on the graphics. Andrea worked on that article with me and helped me construct concepts and figure out wording for many nights. Like I

have said before we discussed things at times all night until the sun came up. I'm quite sure that was one of those times. I would read a sentence or paragraph and we would rework it and discuss it. Of course it's not up to Andrea's writing skill. She didn't write it. We collaborated closely on it together. Andrea didn't want that published because we were friends. She wanted to get it published because she felt it was an important articles. Hell I don't know maybe she wanted to do it there because of what she had to deal with at home. I don't know. John Money is the big daddy of your trans movement. You were pro Money back then and your article reflected it. Money had the largest pornography collection in the world and I don't think you even mentioned that except to describe the pornography he showed in his class. You were not at all judging when you said he showed pornography to children. Yes it did get into the published article and i was looking at it on my desk when you mentioned it earlier.

John Stoltenberg

Oh, hey, I was NOT pro John Money! As I explained in a post I believe you deleted, an editor friend at Omni offered me the assignment and I was out of work and we were broke and so I took it (knowing full well I was dealing with a magazine owned by a porn king). I did what every journalist/reporter does when interviewing a subject: make them think I'm on their side so they'll open up. If I had said what I really thought of him, or let on how much he creeped me out, there'd be no interview and I'd not get paid. I say that with no pride. When I turned in the piece that same editor made changes that I never saw before publication. So that article was hardly my finest hour as a writer. And as I explained in another post, some time before I took that assignment Andrea and I read Raymond's book in galleys and shared in conversation our deep aversion for how Money and others had become the careerist and male-supremacist big daddies of sex-change surgery.

I did not mean to suggest that Andrea did not want your review published on its merits; I meant only to make the point that, as the Psychology Today rejection letter clearly states, it is "Nikki Craft's review" — and I thank you for now acknowledging that "[Andrea] didn't write it."

I was also responding to the way you have promoted through social media your finding of that rejection letter and the backstory of the help Andrea gave you as some kind of smoking gun that proves I'm all wrong ("the party's over," you've said). But that document and that backstory and the text excerpts from your book review don't support your case at all.

I'm not saying you should not keep trying to make your case. I'm sure you will, whatever I say. I'm just saying this so-called smoking gun doesn't withstand some simple tests of logic, fact, and common sense.

Kathy Miriam

John Stoltenberg what is your evidence beyond quotes from woman hating tht she was trans I clusive. I heard diffeently from Jan Raymond and Mary daly both of whom I was close to on the eighties. I Ave always defendednypur work and now am deeply sickened by how you have had the fall to appropriate it from your own agenda. Male sex right I think?

Had the "gall" not "fall"

Katarina Vidović

M2t say they are women and, apparently, whenever a radical feminist utters "all women" she is taken for granted to be trans inclusive (unless she declared herself explicitly as trans exclusive). Do you expect any sane woman would buy this perverted logic?

Nikki Craft

i have not deleted anything you have written. I don't delete without an explanation or some process. It's you who has censored people, not me.

John Stoltenberg

Oh ok thanks.. I was looking for that post and couldn't find it and jumped to conclusions.

If you're referring to the very long thread I deleted from my FB timeline Wednesday night, I sent you a PM Thursday morning explaining that. I'll dupe it here ICYMI: What happened with Facebook was that I just learned late yesterday there was a way to make my privacy settings allow only friends to comment on my

timeline. For some reason I thought that was automatically the case and yesterday it became clear to me that people were showing up I never would have friended. What was happening in that thread was people coming from all over to leave comments, each one of which was sending a notification to friends of mine and family members who had simply liked the original post about Julie's video (which I had posted in good faith because I honestly liked it). I never wanted my timeline to be bulletin board for the world, and that's what that thread had turned into. People can say whatever they want about me elsewhere — I'm a semi public figure and a semi grownup, I can take it — but this was my digital living room where I wanted friends and family to know they could drop by without getting harassed by notifications from strangers' venting their anger at me. So once I learned there was a way to fix things, I changed my FB settings to allow only friends to post. I feel like a FB fool for not knowing that before but I didn't. And the only way I could think of to solve what had happened in that thread about Julie's video retroactively was to delete the whole thing. Maybe there was another way but I didn't know it. If there was a way to save the thread I didn't know it. A lot was said there I would have preserved if I knew how. I was away from the thread for a few hours and when I came back and saw it had exploded, I just did fast all I knew how to do.

Nikki Craft

Clarification: I wrote the above that I do not delete before he posted about five urls to his conversation project and other pages instead of writing out specific replies, then I explained and documented why I was deleting his links.

john you deleted a thread that went on for days about censorship and how it was important to listen to people you did not agree with. you posted that not me. Grandiose as hell. Then when you got in an uncomfortable situation you silenced your adversaries; you pressed delete without concern that people had worked for hours on writing that clearly to contribute to the conversation you had requested. So whatever else you write is crap. But that is not the only place you have censored critics. You have repeatedly deleted posts as you wish and in fact you are now known for it on twitter.

John Stoltenberg

Well, to reiterate, I've said I'm fine with that conversation happening but I did not ask for it to take take place in my digital living room. FB notifications are serious business. Several friends and family innocently "liked" Julie's video without expecting to be barraged by notifications each time someone vented at me. I'm not saying I did the right thing; I'm saying I did the only thing I knew how to do at the time, and I'm saying I had a perfect right to do it, because it was a personal timeline; it was not a public forum.

John Stoltenberg

Since we seem to be talking here, there's a question I'd like to ask you, if it's ok. Just don't answer if it's not. The question has to do with your vow to not ever to send anything to Andrea's collection at the Schlesinger — a collection that as you may know already has a good number of files of Andrea's correspondence with you. You are perfectly within your rights to do whatever you like with your materials related to Andrea. You could give them to a different library. You could bequeath them. You could, as you have said you would, burn them. And I get that that last thing was said in anger at me; But what I want to ask is whether you're aware that only Andrea's legacy gets hurt if her important relationship with you is not available to future researchers and scholars and biographers. I know of one scholar, for instance, who has made extensive use of Andrea's papers for the purpose of looking at female friendships, Andrea's in particular. And she intends to publish about that (if she has not already). Your depriving Andrea's legacy of your documentation of her friendship with you has no impact on me personally whatsoever. As executor of her estate I'm disappointed, of course. But as me, John, I'm unaffected. Your withholding only has a negative consequence for Andrea's legacy to the extent that future researchers will try to tell it. So I hope a time will come when you reconsider.

Nikki Craft

THIS IS NOW IN A NOTE CALLED THE WORST KIND OF BETRAYAL

John I did delete that link to promote your writings and your play. You told me i would not be allowed to post my links on your page. Please apply the same to yourself when you are here. reply as you need to but no links please.

John Stoltenberg

Well, I'm afraid my response disappeared then. It was a good-faith answer to your post, not a promotion, but it's your page and your call.

Nikki Craft

you are welcome to reply but have the courtesy to hold yourself to the same restrictions that you apply to me. feel free to write your reply. Oh and if you feel a little at loss because what you wrote just disappeared before your eyes you can know how others felt when you did that to them.

John Stoltenberg

OK, got it, I know how it feels. I don't recall telling you what you could and couldn't post to my timeline, and I'm not sure I would put any restrictions on that since I'd always have the option, once I read what you said, of hiding it from my friends if I wanted. Be that as it may, I'll be mindful in the future and not risk erasure by including a URL, no matter how germane.

Nikki Craft

well you deleted the evidence where you said it. But i do happen to have the early part of that thread so I'll see if i can hunt it up.

oh really? he always had the option of hiding things so his story about deleting the thread makes no sense.

John Stoltenberg

I could not hide a thread I started. I could hide a thread someone else started. At least that's what I thought to be the case.

Nikki Craft

check your settings at the top of each post. you can make it so only you can view it for that thread.

I can't believe you are claiming that you did not restrict me from posting the links to my writing on your fb page. I respected your request.

John Stoltenberg

Well, I'm still learning Facebook, obviously.

Nikki Craft, Posted Separately — Recounting an Earlier Thread

Posted a few days after the exchange above, quoting from a thread Stoltenberg had since deleted:

John Stoltenberg: "I respectfully request that people discontinue posting on my timeline if all they have to say is what they don't like about trans folk."

Nikki Craft: "John I thought you wanted a conversation and it seems you would like to shut it down with Gloria giving a salute and saying that the Trans Ideology should not be questioned. That doesn't seem right. These are some intelligent women giving you a civil exchange. Why can't their questions be answered?"

John Stoltenberg: "Yes I want a civil conversation and have contributed to The Conversations Project to that end. But this is different; this is my timeline. I no longer want my timeline to be a forum for people saying what they don't like about trans people than I want it to be a forum for people to say what they don't like about...any other derogated social category you could name, including women. There are plenty places on line for prejudice sharing. My timeline is not one of them."

Nikki Craft: "Yes that's understandable. I think of these facebook pages as like having a little livingroom and we have exactly the right to decide what is happening there. I will respect that, at the same time I would remind you that you have posted pretty widely to and tagged numerous women's twitter and facebook pages who did not welcome you doing so. I read a few men complaining about it too. You posted on my facebook page just the other day with links and that was fine by me. You are welcomed to post your side of things to correct misconceptions or have your say on any of my pages. So now that you are closing off this transitory fluid exchange from your page (as opposed to the rigid controlled dolling out of this convo you're a partner in) I now

would like to post my own links to your page? I have not done so out of respect to you and with your permission I would like to do so now. btw what the heck are you doing up so late? I never knew you to be up at this time. smile emoticon"

Nikki Craft: "I have been told in private email by John that my criticisms of the way he is using Andrea's writings to promote his trans agenda are not welcomed on his page, that they will not be understood by his FB audience. Whatever his reasons I will respect that and this will be my last comment on this thread. We have almost thirty friends in common and if they, or anyone else is, interested please feel free to private message me and I will send the links in private email."

Nikki Craft: "Sorry John, but I do need to acknowledge this. You posted Julie Bindel's video against censorship along with this introduction: 'If there is to be civil discourse on this critically contested topic — and more important, if there is to be harm reduction and healing — the imperative in this sentence from this video must go both ways: Let us hear the arguments put forward by those with whom we disagree so that we can expand our knowledge and show rational resistance.' And now you are silencing people who came to have a civil exchange. As I said it is your decision, but do note the irony. Lastly, and I could be wrong about it, but I have an idea that perhaps more than you being concerned that your readers might not understand that this thread might have caused instead a much greater understanding. I know it did for me."

Craft's note appended: "Unfortunately the part of the thread where it became apparent that it was going to continue and I asked if i could post the urls to my article were deleted by you. This was a huge important thread and you erased it. So you will just have to take my word for it that t I did ask again if I could post the links and you said no and I said I would respect that."

Notes on Sourcing

Primary source: screenshotted Facebook thread, facebook.com/nikkiXXcraft/posts/161266137590173, original exchange February 27, 2016, screenshots dated February 27, 2023. Transcribed verbatim from the screenshots, including apparent typos in third-party commenters' text (preserved rather than corrected, to keep the record faithful to what was actually posted).

This document takes no specific position on the underlying disputes — whether Andrea Dworkin consented to coauthorship of the book review in question, and her actual views on trans-inclusive politics — both of which remain genuinely contested between people who knew her directly. We will be speculating elsewhere, however. This document is presented as a documentary record of what was said, by whom, in what order, for the historical record.

Companion documents, family tag AD: AD-1, this document — first entry in the Andrea Dworkin Legacy documentation series.

Compiled by Claude (Anthropic) in collaboration with Nikki Craft. Craft's history, experience, and analysis are the foundation; Claude's contribution is research, structure, and composition. Last edited: draft 1, July 22, 2026.